

cedures, and that duty will devolve upon the district judge. As a matter of fact, we understand that there is already in Montgomery County a system of training and instruction for those who are operating in the committing magistrate field and that such a program inaugurated by the administrative judge or the appointive judge could provide safeguards with which you are concerned. However, to require that only lawyers be permitted to issue warrants as commissioners would seriously cripple the efficiency of the operation, particularly in the rural areas, and we must, therefore, oppose the amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: Mr. President, I direct this question to Delegate Chabot.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does Delegate Chabot yield to a question?

DELEGATE CHABOT: Certainly.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Weidemeyer.

DELEGATE WEIDEMEYER: I would ask if he would accept an amendment to his amendment, that after the word "a", in line 5 of his amendment, strike out "member of the bar of the State," and insert in lieu thereof, "graduate of a school which furnishes a course of study for one month for commissioners as prescribed by rule."

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Chabot?

DELEGATE CHABOT: No, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak in favor of the amendment?

*(There was no response.)*

Does any delegate desire to speak in opposition?

Delegate Harry Taylor?

DELEGATE H. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the Convention, I would like to speak in opposition to this motion and in doing so, speak for just a second on consensus, extra-sensory perception and perhaps functional division.

Delegate Bard says that in every deliberative assembly there comes at some time a consensus.

Now, how do we detect this consensus? Can we do it by extra-sensory perception?

Are there some of us so sensitive that can know when everybody has made his mind?

I am not endowed with that gift, but I found in the back row here of the Convention some evidence of the way I think I detect a consensus. When the delegates begin to beat their heads on the desk, and scream "question, question," I begin to feel that the collective judgment of the Convention has been reached, and that further debate on the point is indeed futile.

None of us wants to waste our breath because indeed, some day each of us will be gasping for it, and it has been significant to me that those here in the chamber who know the most, and who are most experienced in the art of government, both by experience as well as study, are those who have spoken the least up to this time.

Now, I go to functional division, and I think perhaps the most delightful functional division that we observe is the division between the green and red lights.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have thirty seconds.

DELEGATE H. TAYLOR: — when we close another chapter in these constitutional proceedings, and I ask now that you help me see that the reds function the best and let us bury this amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does any other delegate desire to speak?

Delegate Chabot.

DELEGATE CHABOT: It is obvious what I say now will not affect the outcome of this amendment. Notwithstanding the fact that it will mean that this Convention has determined that a person's property is far more important than a person's liberty. However, I think it is important that we consider the remarks that were made by Delegate Harry Taylor.

I suggest that we realize a bit more that we are drafting here and unfortunately to a great extent drafting on the floor here a constitution, not a statute.

We are not going to have next year or the year after to remedy the defects. We are not going to have a Legislative Council in between that is going to study it and call us back to special session, if necessary.

I suggest that we be willing to take whatever time is necessary, whether it means Saturdays, Sundays or between December 12th and January 12th, and try to come up